

Se



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/954,685	09/14/2001	Alec A. Ciolac	ATI.0100720	8450
34456	7590	08/04/2004	EXAMINER	
TOLER & LARSON & ABEL L.L.P. 5000 PLAZA ON THE LAKE STE 265 AUSTIN, TX 78746			TUNG, KEE M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2676	
DATE MAILED: 08/04/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

11

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/954,685

Applicant(s)

CIOLAC, ALEC A.

Examiner

Kee M Tung

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 and 26-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 and 26-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment and RCE filed 5/27/04 have been considered in preparing this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-24 and 26-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thorner (6,232,932).

Thorner teaches a system and a method for providing modular reconfigurable multi-function displays (MFD) for computer simulations (Figs. 1A and 1B) comprising storing a first set of display data in a first/second portions (Blocks A and B) of a frame buffer (VRAM 220), wherein the first set of display data is associated with a first/second virtual displays; selecting (channel selector 340) one of the first virtual display or the second virtual display to be presented by a display device (380); when the first/second virtual display is selected, providing data from the first/second portions of the frame buffer to a display controller (such as, LCD driver 241-244) for presentation on the display device. It is noted that the present invention partitions the frame buffer into two portions where the prior art to Thorner partitions the frame buffer into 4 portions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to replaced 4 blocks to any number of blocks, such as, 2, 4, 8, 16

Art Unit: 2676

as taught by Thorner (col. 9, lines 34-39 and 55-57). Therefore, at least claims 1 and 2 would have been obvious.

As per claim 3, Thorner teaches the frame buffer is associated with video hardware (200) connected to the display device.

As per claims 4 and 5, Thorner teaches selecting one of the first virtual display or the second virtual display includes identifying an event trigger (by microcontroller 310 and user input devices 330, 336 and 340 and col. 13, lines 22-67).

As per claim 6, Thorner teaches the event trigger includes a mouse position is well known (such as, point and click, col. 2, lines 39-41).

As per claim 7, Thorner teaches the event trigger includes activity associated with an application on one of the first virtual display or the second virtual display (obvious by the separated blocks of frame buffer).

As per claim 8, Thorner teaches operating system desktop is expanded over the first and second virtual displays (100).

Claims 9-22 are similar in scope to claims 1-8, and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 23, 24 and 26-29 are also similar in scope to claims 1-22, and additionally require a data processor (CPU) and a memory (system memory), and thus are also rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 30-42 are also similar in scope to claims 1-22, and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 43, Thorner teaches the first application being different than the second application, and the **first** (or second) application not being associated with the **first** application (obvious in view of Fig. 3 and respective areas of the specification, such as, independent image).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The feature “the **first** application not being associated with the **first** application” is indefinite.

Response to Arguments


4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 and 26-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kee M Tung whose telephone number is 703-305-9660. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday - Friday from 5:30 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on 703-308-6829. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kee M Tung
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2676